


NO. 5:17-CV-23-FL

Defendants.

rulings alone almost never constitute a valid basis for a bias or partiality motion,” Liteky v. United States, 510 U.S. 540, 555 (1994), and plaintiff does not provide a basis for departing from this rule in this case. Further, a judge’s working relationship with other judges of the court does not present grounds for “personal bias or prejudice concerning a party” 28 U.S.C. § 455(b)(1); see Shaw, 733 F.2d at 308. Therefore, plaintiff’s motion for recusal is DENIED.

Turning to plaintiff’s motions pursuant to Rule 60(b) and 73, plaintiff fails to establish that she has a meritorious defense to the final judgment entered January 28, 2020; a lack of unfair prejudice to the non-moving party; or that exceptional circumstances justify revisiting the judgment. Accordingly, plaintiff has not met the threshold requirements for relief under Rule 60(b). See Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. v. AMH Roman Two NC, LLC, 859 F.3d 295, 299 (4th Cir. 2017). In addition, Rule 73 does not provide a basis for the court to correct or revise docket entries upon plaintiff’s request in the manner plaintiff seeks. Therefore, plaintiff’s motions under Rule 60(b) and 73 are DENIED.

SO ORDERED, this the 30th day of March, 2023.


LOUISE W. FLANAGAN
United States District Judge